



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Μαπαβαθα, 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

PROF. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

HAMILTON, N. Y.

THERE are several problems connected with this expression. It is certain that we have before us a transliteration of two Aramaic words, and that the first syllable is ܠܕ = Lord. Everything else is, in fact, subject to doubt. No consensus of opinion has yet been reached as to the proper pronunciation of the Greek letters, the accuracy of the transliteration, the form and meaning of the original Aramaic words, the significance of the expression, and the reason for its presence in this context.

The eight letters occur in **Σ**, A, B, and C, but, as the words are not divided, and accents and breathings are not indicated, no light is thrown by these manuscripts on the peculiar difficulties of the case. F (*Augiensis Cantabrigiensis*, ix.) and G (*Boernerianus Dresdensis*, ix.) write μαπαβαθα. Among the uncials provided with accents and breathings we notice the following types of tradition :

μαπαβαθά, M (*Londinensis*, ix.) ; 6 minuscules according to Scrivener support this reading.

μαράβαθα, E (*Petropolitanus Caesarius Muralti*, ix.).

μαρὰν ἀθά, D^{xxx} (editor of *Claromontanus*, ix.) and L (*Angelicus Romanus*, ix.).

μαρᾶν ἀθᾶ, B³ (x. or xi.).

Three minuscules, according to Tischendorf ed. vii., give μαπαβαθα̃. The *marā thana* of r (*Monacensis Vet. Lat.*, vi.) is probably a scribal error. The other codices of *Vetus Latina*, d, e, and f, have *maranatha* as one word ; so also codex *Amiatinus* of the Vulgate.

Which, if any, of these readings should be accepted as presenting the true pronunciation? Μαπαβαθά was preferred by Lachmann, Tischendorf ed. vii., Grimm, and Thayer, in the *Lexicon*. Μαρὰν ἀθά was accepted by Rec., Griesbach, Tischendorf ed. viii., Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort. Were this a question that could be determined on the principles ordinarily applied by the textual critic of the New Testament, the choice would undoubtedly lie between these two

readings; for E has no independent value, and B³ is later, stands alone, and is, if anything, less difficult. But in the case of foreign words where only accents and breathings are concerned, those principles find little or no application. The copyists of the ninth century no doubt faithfully reproduced the traditional pronunciation, but nothing vouches for its correctness; a better informed man in the eleventh may have written the words more correctly.

In this instance, they were probably all wrong. It seems necessary to reject every accented text that is known to us, ancient or modern, written or printed. Paul de Lagarde, indeed, went so far as to declare: "Auch Cor. α 16, 22 muss man *μαρὰν ἀθᾶ* schreiben oder auf den Ruhm ein verständiger Mann zu sein verzichten" (*Ges. Abh.* 1866, p. 39). This appears to me also to be what Paul would have written, if he had penned the words in Greek and supplied the accents and breathings. Nevertheless the judgment is somewhat too sweeping. For Wellhausen is quite a sensible man, and yet he thinks that the words should be written *μαράνα θᾶ* (quoted by Nöldeke, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1884, p. 1023), and Nöldeke himself, who regards this as probable (l.c.), has no superior as an Aramaist. Both forms, however, imply the rejection of the traditional texts on the ground of subjective judgment.

The accuracy of the transliteration was doubted by Luther, who thought the Aramaic words were מוֹתָהּ מַחֲרָם, and by Bullinger, who imagined that the original was מַחֲרַמְתָּא, as one word. Concerning Luther's view it is sufficient to quote the remark of Cornelius a Lapide, "longe distat מוֹתָהּ מַחֲרָם a maranatha"; and there is no such word as Bullinger's synonym for מַחֲרָם. The idea was probably suggested by Paul of Burgos, whose doubts, however, were of a more radical nature. He thought that the word was a mixture, due to ignorance, of three words, viz. נִדְיִי, מַחֲרָם, and שְׁמַתָּא, which he explained as אַתָּא (ה) שֵׁם אַתָּא. But it is not very likely that either Paul himself or any of his disciples should have been so incompetent as to twist מַחֲרָם נִדְיִי שְׁמַתָּא into מַרְנַתָּא or *mapavaθa*; besides, Buxtorf and Levy are probably right in pointing שְׁמַתָּא and deriving this word from שְׁמַד.

In the reaction against these suppositions, modern scholars have well nigh universally assumed that the transliteration is absolutely correct. It has become the postulate even of the various conjectural divisions of the word-complex, that Paul must have accurately reproduced in Greek letters the sound of the Aramaic expression. Billroth, indeed, propounded the notion that Paul wrote the two words

in Aramaic to show his familiarity with that language (*Kommentar*, 1833). But such display of linguistic knowledge would not be in harmony with the apostle's character. For purposes of identification we know that he deemed a few words written in Greek with his own hand sufficient (2 Thess. iii. 17). A desire to have his strongest denunciation of the Palestinian opponents understood only by them might be conceived of as a motive for couching it in Aramaic letters, were it not that we should then expect the preceding words, particularly *ἀνάθεμα*, to be also in the Aramaic. Hence Billroth's view has been generally discarded.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that the transliteration is altogether perfect, and I deem it quite within the bounds of probability that another man than Paul made it. In the LXX alpha is used to represent a number of Hebrew vowel sounds. Initial š^ewā is, I think, more frequently reproduced by an alpha than by an epsilon, e.g. שָׂאָא Σαββα, סָאָא Σαβα, מִנְשֵׁה מανασση, וְזַכָּרְיָהוּ Ζαχαρίας, צָמְרִי Σαμαρείος; in שִׁנְאָר Σεναρ, נִתְנָאֵל Ναθαναηλ, et al., medial š^ewā is rendered in the same way. Nor is this to be explained by "die Neigung, den Lautwerth des š^ewā mobile dem folgenden Vocal zu conformiren" (Kautzsch, *Gramm. des Bibl. Aram.*, p. 8). For we also meet such transliterations as שְׁלֹמֹה Σαλομων, שְׁמוּאֵל Σαμουηλ, נְבוֹכַדְרֶצַּר Ναβουκοδοροσορ, פָּרְעֹה Φαραω. Hāteph s^gôl is represented by alpha in אֲמֹרָיִם Ἀμορραῖοι, et al.; s^gôl by alpha in פָּלֶן Φαλεκ, יָפֶת Ιαφεθ, הָעֵר אֶבֶן Αβενέζερ, in the Aramaic portion of Ezra דְּרָוּא Δαναῖοι; and even šērê by alpha in עֵמֶק קִצְיִין Αμεκασεις (beside Lucian's Εμεκκασεις) Josh. xviii. 21; et al. Aquila, Theodotus, and Symmachus transliterate in the same manner; in Theodotion's version of Daniel בִּלְטַשְׁאֶצַּר appears as Βαλτασαρ. שְׁבַקְתָּנִי σαβαχθανει, דָּמָא δαμαχ, לָמָא λαμα (BD), probably רִיקָא ρακα, and possibly רִיבֹנִי ραββοννι, show that the New Testament writers were no more accurate. The author of James was as good a Jew, and, no doubt, as familiar with Aramaic, as Paul, yet he wrote Σαβωθ for צְבָאוֹת. We are not warranted by the facts in tacitly assuming that every alpha in *μαρναθα* represents a pathah or a kâmes, whether the Greek letters were written by Paul or by another man. Billroth's reason for supposing that Paul wrote the words originally in Aramaic characters does not commend itself.

But there is another that naturally suggests itself. It is not probable that the formula originated with Paul. Even if his state of mind, when he penned the words, bordered on the psychical condition of the glossolalist, as Edwards maintains (*Commentary*, 1885), a familiar

phrase would be more likely to suggest itself than one absolutely new. This *formula solemnis* presumably had its origin in the mother church. The founders of the Christ party may have brought it to Corinth (so Schmiedel, *Hand-Commentar*, 1891, p. 173), and used it to express their longing for the Lord's return and their equally ardent desire for the punishment of the law-abolishing pseudo-apostle at the parousia. If Paul had in mind the leaders of this party, who could claim to have had personal relations with the Christ whose return they expected, there would seem to be a remarkable appropriateness in his adding to the anathema designed to be read by the whole church, as a solemn prayer and warning especially intended to strike the eye of some of these opponents, their own favorite formula, thereby to arouse their conscience and to bear witness to his own unwavering confidence. Some zealous disciple of Paul may then be supposed to have transliterated the words for the benefit of his party with neither more nor less accuracy than was the wont of his countrymen in such matters.

As regards the form and meaning of the Aramaic words, the following suggestions have been made :

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܝܢ = 'Ο κύριος ἦλθε, or 'Ο κύριος ἡμῶν ἦκει, 'Ο κύριος παρα-
γέγονεν; so Schol. Cod. 7, 49, 19 resp., also Chrysostom, Jerome, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Field (*Otium Norvicense*, iii. 1881, p. 110 ff.), Payne Smith (*Thesaurus Syriacus*, 1883, col. 2205), Kautzsch (*Grammatik, Nachträge*, p. 174).

The views of Paul of Burgos, Luther, Bullinger, and Calvin, agreeing in the supposition of a $\sqrt{\text{ܐܬܐ ܡܪܝܢ}}$ in the original, have been referred to above.

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܢܐ = Our Lord will come; so Grimm, *et al.*

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܝܢ = Our Lord cometh; so Buxtorf, p. 1248.

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܝܢ = Our Lord cometh; so Kautzsch, *Gramm.*, p. 12, *et al.*

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܢܐ = Our Lord, come! So, following a suggestion of Bickell's (*Z. f. Kath. Th.* viii. 1884, p. 403 note), Wellhausen (l.c.); Nöldeke (l.c.); Weizsäcker (*Apost. Zeitalter*, 1890, p. 602); Schmiedel (l.c.).

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܝܢ = O Lord, come! So Siegfried, *Z. f. w. T.* 1885, p. 128.

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܝܢ = Our Lord is the sign; so Klostermann, *Probleme*, p. 220 ff.

ܐܬܐ ܡܪܢܐ = A Lord art thou; so Hofmann, *Kommentar, ad loc.*

So far as the language is concerned, there is no objection to understanding the verb as a preterite. This view, however, scarcely affords a satisfactory explanation of the sequence of ideas. There is no

natural transition of thought from the ἀνάθεμα to the greeting; for neither "the Lord came and gave us authority to anathematize" nor "the Lord came, and therefore there is no excuse for not loving him" seems suitable. Payne Smith explains: "Dominus noster venit, jam manifestatus est, quae verba pro forma anathematis minime habenda sunt, sed gaudium fidelium in Christi incarnatione exprimunt" (l.c.). But how is it conceivable that such a sudden outburst of joy should have immediately followed the sad and solemn anathema? Besides, the incarnation is seldom, if ever, referred to at all in Paul's writings, while the coming of Christ in the sense of his return from heaven meets us in every epistle.

The smoothest rendering of the two words would perhaps be gained if we were free to interpret the verb as referring to the future and to translate, "The Lord will come." But, as Nestle well says, "Wenn *aḥa* das aramäisch-syrische Perfectum ܐܬܐ, ܐܬܐ ist, kann es kaum, man möchte fast sagen unmöglich, diese präsentisch-futurische Bedeutung haben" (*Th. Stud. aus Württemberg*, v., 1884, p. 187). It has been defended as a *perfectum propheticum*, but the genius of the Aramaic is averse to the use of this perfect. In almost every instance where the Hebrew has a *perfectum confidentiae*, the Targum has either an impf. or a participial construction. In Isa. v. 13, it is doubtful how the interpreter understood his text. In the Aramaic inscription, *Corpus Inscr. Sem., pars secunda, tomus I, fasc. 2, No. 149*, found in Egypt and probably belonging to the fourth century B.C., the ܐܬܐ may not be governed at all by the ܐܬܐ preceding it by several illegible lines, and would at most be a *futurum exactum*. The preference for a participial construction is well illustrated by the very passage, Phil. iv. 5, 'Ο κύριος ἐγγύς, so often quoted in behalf of this view, which the Pešitta renders *māran ʔaribh hū*.

In spite of his consciousness that it is well nigh impossible to defend this "präsentisch-futurische Bedeutung," Nestle falls back upon it at the close of his article, declaring: "da dieselbe Formel in der neuveröffentlichten Quelle (Διδαχὴ) einfache Umschreibung von ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ 1 Kor. xi. 26 ist, kann es auch xvi. 22 nicht wohl anders gefasst werden" (l.c.). That *μαρναθα* in Διδαχὴ is a simple paraphrase of ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ, is a gratuitous assumption. There is nothing in the context to indicate that the author of Διδαχὴ thought of Paul's words. And what kind of paraphrase would *μαρναθα* be of ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ? The idea of "coming" is the only thing the two expressions have in common. I agree with Nestle that "die Beziehung auf die Parusie ist immer noch das wahrscheinlichste"; but only by assum-

ing, against Nestle, that the verb is in the imv., can I find such a reference to the parousia.

Klostermann renders: "Whoever kisseth not the Lord, let him be anathema; our Lord is the sign." That the brotherly kiss was given at the supper, we know from Justin (*Apol.* i. 65); but that a formula was used in administering the kiss, and that *μαρναῖα* was such a formula cannot be proved. Besides, how can the Lord be kissed, and how can he be a sign at the supper? If the Lord is kissed when a member of the church is kissed, is not rather the kiss a sign of the recognition of his presence?

Hofmann's translation seems to me to introduce an irrelevant thought; it is not certain that the final *a* in the 2nd masc. sing. was pronounced at the time this was written, and the silent š^ewā could not have been represented by an alpha. The last objection holds true also against Siegfried, who tentatively proposed מָרַן תָּא, though I agree with this scholar in the general conception of the expression.

Grimm, Kautzsch, Wellhausen, Nöldeke, and Schmiedel assume that the first word ended with an aleph. It is true that in Ezra, Daniel, Jonathan, and Onkelos, the suffix is invariably written נָא, and the analogy of אֱלֹהֵינָא and רִיבוֹנֵנָא points to מָרַנָא (or מָרְנָא). The *māran* 'ethā of the Pešitta cannot, of course, be urged against this view. But neither is it possible to infer from מֵרָאנָא (*Talmud Babli*, *Nedarim* 50 *a*) that the closing vowel was retained by Palestinian Christians in the first century. In the fourth or fifth century A.D. (Nöldeke in 1868 assigned the fragments to the fourth century, *Z.D.M.G.* xxii., 523 ff.; in 1887 to the fifth, *Semitische Sprachen*, p. 33), the Aramaic-speaking Christians of Palestine and Peræa seem to have dropped the final vowel in some instances. The simple *lan* occurs, e.g. Gal. ii. 4 (J. R. Harris, *Biblical Fragments from Mt. Sinai*, 1890), while Ezra, Daniel, Jonathan, and Onkelos invariably write לָנָא, and the character of the translation forbids the assumption of dependence upon the Pešitta. The question is thus left open, and may be determined by the second word. If this was 3 m. s. pf. Peal אָתָא, it is scarcely conceivable that the important first aleph should have been dropped either in pronunciation or in writing, and if this aleph is represented by the Greek alpha, there is nothing in the text, and, as we have seen, nothing in the language, to force the assumption of a suppressed final aleph of the first word. If, on the other hand, it was 2 m. s. imv. Peal, we shall see that there is no necessity for supposing a suppression of its initial vowel.

The interpreters who understand the verbal form as an imperative

all take for granted that this imperative was **תא**. *Tā* is, indeed, the regular form in the Edessene, and the aleph is constantly omitted in the Neo-Hebraic writings. It is also quite possible that in later Babylonian Aramaic this aleph, while retained in writing, was slurred over in pronunciation, as is the aleph of the imv. prim. rad. hamz. after a *wa* or *fa* in Arabic. But it is significant that even in the Edessene the aleph was both written and pronounced in the majority of pe aleph verbs, and that, according to a private communication from Professor Harris, the initial aleph appears in the imv. of both *'ethā* and *'ezal* in the recently discovered Syriac gospels. It is never omitted in the Mandæan scriptures.

Of far greater importance, however, is the fact that in this verb the aleph of the imperative was written and pronounced at the time the book of Daniel was supplied with vowel points (cf. Dan. iii. 26 **אתא**), and also when the Targums were committed to writing (cf. e.g. **אתא** in Onkelos Gen. xix. 32; xxxi. 44; xxxvii. 13; Ex. iii. 10; Num. x. 29; xxii. 6, 17; xxiii. 7, 27; xxiv. 14, and Jonathan to Jud. xi. 6; xix. 11; 1 Sam. ix. 5; xiv. 1, 6; xvii. 44; xx. 11; 2 Sam. xiv. 32; 2 Kings v. 5; x. 16; Isa. xxii. 15; Jer. xl. 4; Ez. iii. 4, 11; the yod being especially valuable as indicating that aleph was vocalized).

In the Samaritan Pentateuch this initial aleph of the imperative is also preserved. It generally appears as **אתי**. But **אתה** also occurs, as in Num. xxii. 17, where it is adopted by Volders, Num. xxiv. 14, where it is found in the Nablus Mss. and the London Polyglot, and Num. xxii. 6 in one Ms.

Kautzsch's objection to **אתא** as an imv., that **אתי** would be expected, has been withdrawn with the remark, that "targumisch auch **אתא** und **אתה** allerdings unter zweifelhafter Aussprache vorkomme." Siegfried, who communicates this (l.c.), expresses my own observation when he says: "nur für **אתה** haben wir Beispiele mit der Bedeutung des Imperativ gefunden." But when he continues: "der obige Imperativ wird auch zu **תא** verkürzt in den häufigen Formeln **תא שמע, תא הוי**," I fear that he has not only gone outside the Targumic, but also outside the realm of Palestinian Aramaic. Even in the Evangelium this imperative is regularly written **אתה** (cf. Nöldeke, *Z.D.M.G.* xxii. 1868, pp. 467 and 497). No passage has yet been adduced where in undoubted Palestinian Aramaic the initial aleph of the imperative of **אתה** has been dropped.

As to the uncertainty of the pronunciation of **אתה** in the Targums, Kautzsch is unquestionably right. Berliner's ed. of Onkelos, as a

rule, prints the imperative אִתָּא. But in Gen. xxxvii. 13 it appears as אִתָּא. This is also the vowelling of the word in Ex. iii. 10 in the recently discovered Codex Socini 84. From the extracts given by Kautzsch (*Mitteilung*, 1893), this codex seems to be so far superior to the previously known editions as to suggest the query whether this is not, after all, the earlier and truer pronunciation. The greater authority and the higher age would still remain with the Massoretic punctuation of Ezra and Daniel, and the probable development, that from ḥaṭṭēph s^gôl to s^gērê. *Mapāv āṭhā* would, in this case, have come from an Aramaic אִתָּא מַרְוִי.

The case of *Marthaïos* = אִתָּא מַרְתָּי, quoted by Nöldeke (l.c.), to show that the initial א may have been early dropped, indicates, no doubt, the tendency in this direction. But there may have been special reasons for this change. Proper names, which so often mirror individual taste, are more readily influenced by linguistic tendencies than verbal forms are.

Nestle's only objection to an imperative in this case he states as follows: "Nach meinem Gefühl müsste in diesem Fall ganz entschieden das Verbum voraus-, der Vocativ nachstehen" (l.c.). There are few men whose feeling I would more readily trust than Nestle's in a question of this kind; but the facts force me this time to dissent. It is true that in Rev. xxii. 20 the Pešitta reads *tā mārṡā Yešū*. But in Matt. viii. 21, 25, xiv. 30; Luke xi. 1, xiii. 8; John iv. 15, 49, xiv. 8, not to mention numerous other passages, the vocative precedes, and the imperative follows, and in John xi. 34 the very form *māran tā* occurs. If, in this case, the addition of another inv. has caused *māran* to take the first place, the addition of *Yešū* in Rev. xxii. 20 may have pushed the *tā* to the front. In view of מַלְכָּא לְעֵלְמָן חַי (Dan. iii. 9), even that is doubtful. This last passage is of more importance than the others, since in the New Testament the order of the words in the original may have determined the translator.

However the verb is understood, it is more in harmony with the genius of the English language to render the noun "the Lord," or "O Lord," respectively, than "our Lord." For while the nun is the suffix, and not *nun heemanticum*, as Castelli supposed, the consciousness of the pronoun was probably obscured early, the case being parallel to the Hebrew אֲדֹנָי, the Phoenician בעלתי (*Baalṭis*), the Philistine *marna*, the Arabic *rabbi*, the modern *madonna*, *notre dame*, *monsieur*, my lord, *mynheer*. The effect of this tendency upon the writing of *rabbi* [without the *y*], and upon the pronunciation of *monsieur*, mylord, suggests an additional ground for suppos-

ing that the final aleph in מְרַנֵּן may have been dropped quite early, first in pronunciation and then in writing.

In order to understand Paul's reason for introducing in this connection a prayer for the parousia, his constant yearning to be with the Lord is scarcely sufficient. Something is expected of the returning Christ, and there is some connection between his coming and the anathema. A thought of vengeance is most suitable. From both epistles it is abundantly clear that the Christ party, in their determined opposition to Paul, subjected him to many indignities. Even if the insult referred to in 2 Cor. ii. 5-11, vii. 7-15, was inflicted upon him at his second visit, there was, no doubt, sufficient cause already for keen resentment. Nor is it apparent that Paul, with his advanced views, could fully appreciate the position of his conservative brethren and altogether dissociate moral turpitude from deep-rooted prejudice or intellectual obtuseness.

But his generous forgiveness of personal affronts makes it difficult to believe that he prays for revenge for himself. Rather is it a prayer that the Lord may avenge himself upon his enemies. That he connected the thought of vengeance with the parousia is evident from 2 Thess. i. 8 *et al.* It is true that he regarded sickness and death as the consequences of unworthily partaking of the Lord's supper (1 Cor. xi. 30) and physical death as the result of solemnly delivering a man to Satan (1 Cor. v. 5), but in these cases he conceived the divine purpose to be, that Christians "may not be condemned with the world," and that "the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord." Concerning the "ministers of Satan," to whom he refers in the passage before us, he cherishes no such hope. Let them be put under the ban, and let the returning Christ, whom they love not, destroy them! This seems to be the connection of thought.

Nevertheless it would be wrong to look upon *maranatha* as a formula of excommunication. This was the idea of the reformers. Even Calvin, as an interpreter *facile princeps* among them, held *ἀνάθεμα μαρاناθα* to be synonymous expressions like *αββα ὁ πατήρ*. This view is impossible since the discovery of the *Διδαχὴ*. The prayer in chapter x. closes :

Ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος.

Ὡσαννα τῷ υἱῷ Δαβὶδ.

Εἰ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἰ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοείτω.

Μαρاناθά. Ἀμήν.

Its occurrence in this passage has led to the supposition that Paul remembered *μαρاناθα* as a liturgical formula used at the Lord's

supper (Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, 602). If this simply means that he had heard the prayer at some agape, that is very probable. For at these common meals it was customary to bring to mind the return as well as the death of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 26; Luke xxii. 16, 18). From the *Διδαχή* it would even appear as if the parousia was remembered more constantly on these occasions than the death, since the latter is not referred to, while the former is suggested by the expectation of a passing away of the present world (cf. also chapter xvi.), the hail to the coming Messianic king, the call for immediate repentance, as well as by the *μαρναθα*, which Paul Sabatier well explains as "le résumé de tous leurs ardents désirs" (*La Didachè*, 1885, p. 107), and, I might add, by the unmistakable *parallelismus membrorum*.

If, on the contrary, Weizsäcker's words imply that the expression had already become a standing eucharistic formula, that is quite unlikely. The words immediately following the prayer in *Διδαχή*, *Τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν*, show how much was left even then to spontaneity and inspiration; and a comparison of the words to be uttered at the eucharist according to *Διδαχή* with the formulas occurring in the New Testament (cf. my article, "The Character of Christ's Last Meal," in this JOURNAL, vol. xi. 1892, p. 18 ff.) makes evident the impossibility of tracing such a straight line of development as Bickell assumes (*Messe und Passah*, 1872, *Z. f. Kath. Th.*, 1884, p. 404 ff.).

Schmiedel regards *μαρναθα* in *Διδαχή* as "unverstandene Formel, und eben deshalb schwerlich so alt, dass man es bei P mit Wzs. 602 für Reminiscenz an das Abendmahl halten dürfte" (l.c.). It may well be that some Gentile converts used the phrase without knowing its meaning. But it is scarcely conceivable that a word of prayer, so appropriate to the occasion, should have been introduced into the service by one who was ignorant of its true import, or that its significance should have been lost between Paul and the author of *Διδαχή*. To me, at least, it appears highly probable that in the circles where this writer moved, Aramaic was no mystery.

If the phrase, nevertheless, should have become unintelligible, it is difficult to see how that would militate against its age. How old it is and how widely it spread in the early church, we do not know. But it is quite permissible to suppose that it started as a spontaneous prayer among the Galilean disciples; that it was often used when in their common meals they remembered the Lord who had died for them, and would come again; that the men who had listened to Jesus in his lifetime, and who had come to Corinth with letters of

recommendation from the church in Jerusalem, frequently used it in their prayers and at the agapes; and that the churches which maintained most strongly the authority of the Twelve gave it a place in the prayer following their love-feasts.

There is no evidence that it was Paul's custom to use it at the *δεῖπνον κυριακόν*, though he may have become familiar with the phrase on such an occasion. If it was known at all in Johannean circles, it is possible that the prayer, once equivalent to the *ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ* (Rev. xxii. 20), while still apprehended in a general way, no longer expressed the hope of a visible return, but rather the desire for a spiritual presence, as is the case in the Fourth Gospel. Finally, it may have gained currency also among those who had only a vague idea of its meaning, even as many an uncomprehended Abba, Hallelujah, Hosanna, Amen, and Sela has graced the speech of pious Christians since. Although the connection of this custom with the phenomenon of glossolaly is, in all probability, far more remote than Dean Plumptre thought, his beautiful words, quoted by Edwards (l.c.), still have a certain degree of relevancy as regards this class of worshipers:

"The spirit came upon us. From our lips
Burst the strange mystic speech of other lands.
We too cried Abba! Lord of Sabbaoth!
We too could raise the Hallelujah chant,
And from our feeble tongues in wondrous tones,
As of the voice of trumpet loud and long,
The mighty Maranatha smote the air."